

Case Number:	CM14-0136317		
Date Assigned:	09/03/2014	Date of Injury:	09/25/2012
Decision Date:	09/30/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/06/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/25/2014

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Anesthesia, has a subspecialty in Acupuncture and Pain Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

45y/o female injured worker with date of injury 9/25/12 with related right elbow and shoulder pain. Per progress report dated 7/24/14, the injured worker complained of right shoulder pain radiating to the right arm and diffuse body pain. She rated her pain 9/10 in intensity. Per physical exam, paraspinal tenderness, fibromyalgia tender points were positive, pain with extension and rotation and strength 5/5 were noted. EMG of the bilateral upper extremities and cervical paraspinal muscles dated 6/19/14 was unremarkable. MRI of the lumbar spine revealed mild disc bulging and posterior annular fissure at L4-L5 as well as Tarlov meningeal root cyst abutting the descending right S2 nerve root. She has been treated with surgery, injections, physical therapy, and medication management. The date of UR decision was 8/6/14.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

The Final Determination was based on decisions for the disputed items/services set forth below:

Norco 5/325mg #60 (refill): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen Page(s): 91,78.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines OPIOIDS Page(s): 78, 91.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding on-going management of opioids "Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: Pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or nonadherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the '4 As' (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any aberrant drug-taking behaviors).The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs."Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of norco nor any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Furthermore, efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. There is no documentation comprehensively addressing this concern in the records available for my review. As MTUS recommends to discontinue opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.

Gralise 30 day starter pack: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs) Page(s): 16-22.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiepilepsy Drugs Page(s): 16-18.

Decision rationale: With regard to antiepilepsy drugs, the MTUS CPMTG states "Fibromyalgia: Gabapentin and pregabalin have been found to be safe and efficacious to treat pain and other symptoms. (Arnold, 2007) (Crofford, 2005) Pregabalin is FDA approved for fibromyalgia."Per MTUS CPMTG, "Gabapentin (Neurontin) has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain."Per MTUS CPMTG p17, "After initiation of treatment there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects."Per progress report dated 2/25/14, it was noted that the injured worker was using gabapentin in the form of Gralise and it was not helping her significantly. As the documentation contains no evidence of improvement in function, the request is not medically necessary.

Gralise 600mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs) Page(s): 16-22.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiepilepsy Drugs Page(s): 16-18.

Decision rationale: With regard to antiepilepsy drugs, the MTUS CPMTG states "Fibromyalgia: Gabapentin and pregabalin have been found to be safe and efficacious to treat pain and other symptoms. (Arnold, 2007) (Crofford, 2005) Pregabalin is FDA approved for fibromyalgia." Per MTUS CPMTG, "Gabapentin (Neurontin) has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain." Per MTUS CPMTG p17, "After initiation of treatment there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects." Per progress report dated 2/25/14, it was noted that the injured worker was using gabapentin in the form of Gralise and it was not helping her significantly. As the documentation contains no evidence of improvement in function, the request is not medically necessary.